

against it only and solely on the ground of the earthly consequences of this horrid sin. In his remarks he ignored the moral criminality of it. Yet more were we astonished when he declared that his faculty would not concern themselves to seek for knowledge of those who commit this sin, but would act only when such knowledge was placed before them.

This is an extreme case. We apprehend that few institutions would be thus criminally neglectful of the associations of the students. But there are minor derelictions that are a source of temptation to the young. Among these, by no means the least is the spirit of worldliness. We use no space to specify. The hint is sufficient to make the parent enquire carefully before entering his child at an unknown school. There are a plenty of schools of high standard from which to select.

### MORE ABOUT "THE NEW RELIGION."

Dr. Eliot's address at the close of the Harvard Summer School of Theology, has been widely advertised. It consisted of a series of negations of fundamental Christian truths, accompanied by assumptions long ago announced by pagan writers and repeated by modern infidelity. Decrying dogma, he becomes the chief of dogmatists, without deigning to furnish either authority or argument to sustain his deliverances. The negations consist of the denial of all authority in religion, a veritable moral and spiritual anarchy. The supernatural is totally rejected. There is to be no deification of remarkable human beings. No mediation between God and man. No promise of future blessedness as the fruit of earthly discipline; no supernatural change of character; no divine energy wrought into our frail humanity. Purely natural love to God and love to man is the comprehensive summary of all that is positive in this pseudo-new religion. The ex-president, of course, spoke for himself alone, and his utterances savor much of an abnormal fondness for getting before the public. He has frequently exhibited a Gladstonian alertness in getting to the front of what he conceives to be new and popular movements.

But rash as these assumptions may be, and insulting to the religious faith of the millions who represent the highest character and intelligence of this or any age, they are logically the "assured results" of modern "liberal" teaching which emanates especially from about Harvard, and on to the westward, but bred from imported stock. Let the assumptions of certain supposedly Christian teachers of the liberal school be granted as premises and the conclusions of Dr. Eliot inevitably follow. It is considered magnanimous to respect all sorts of religious opinion in this twentieth century, but that means that it is magnanimous to respect the destruction of faith, and the abandonment of all religion.

It may interest our readers to peruse some specimen comments of evangelical papers.

Says the Lutheran:

1. "It will not be bound by dogma or creed." That is to say religion is no longer to be a matter of belief, but of good works only. Hence it will make little difference whether the Bible teachings about God, about man, about sin, about redemption in Christ, about eternal life and eternal death, be accepted or not. He who accepts them all has no better chance

of pleasing God and doing His will than he who rejects them all. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and hence what difference does it make whether you plant an apple seed, a cucumber seed, or a poisonous berry seed. As all men can not believe alike, what's the use of believing anything?

2. "The new religion will not be based upon authority. There will be no supernatural element; it will place no reliance on anything but the laws of nature." So away goes the Bible,—without whose indirect rays of light Dr. Eliot himself would have walked in darkness. Hence we are no better off than the American Indian who had nature for his Bible. The horizon of our spiritual world has its boundaries fixed by what we can here see and feel and touch. Surely this is reducing religion to lowest elements. Are we really better off with such a religion than the South Sea Islander was before he was transformed by the gospel?

3. "In the new religion there will be no deification of remarkable human beings. God will be so immanent that no intermediary will be needed." Thus with one fell swoop is the divinity of Christ brought prostrate. That must be a wonderful educator indeed who can unmake him who is called "the mighty God, the Prince of Peace." Wonder where Christianity with all its remarkable conquests would be today if the apostles and all Christians down to the present had believed as Dr. Eliot does?

4. "The new religion will not attempt to reconcile people to present ills by the promise of future compensation." And so there is after all no gateway of relief leading from the sorrows and sufferings of this present life to joys that lie beyond? Verily, how mistaken Jesus and His followers must have been to hold out to the weary and heavy laden the promise of blessedness unspeakable hereafter! If that sort of religion were to be preached in the churches for one year, how many people would be left in the pews to listen to it?

5. All that seems to have a semblance of vitality about this new religion is that it "will be based on the two great commandments"—love to God and love to man. But who is God? How are we to know him if he is not revealed? How can he be revealed if there is no other book but nature in which to read of him? So this new religion takes us away from faith and brings us to two great commandments, and before these it leaves us helpless and undone. Thus we are to have the flower and the fruit of religion, but it must be cut off from its stem. What a withered, wilted thing it will soon be.

But Dr. Eliot wields an enormous influence in the educational world and therein lies the sadness of this utterance of his before a body of intelligent men. Unitarianism has seldom had a more potent hearing than it received from his lips. But the Church of Christ will go on preaching the old gospel of Christ and him crucified—that gospel which though foolishness to men, is yet the power of God and the wisdom of God. Between the teachings of one who spake as never man spake and the teachings of Dr. Eliot who speaks very much as a man, and very otherwise than Jesus did, it will not be difficult for men, who feel the limitations of their nature, to choose. Really, Dr. Eliot's new religion is very old—as old as unbelief itself.

The United Presbyterian contains this racy comment:

Dr. Eliot, president-emeritus of Harvard, has been letting his light shine along the path of the immortals; but it comes a long way from being the light of the world. When a man undertakes to put himself on a level with Jesus of Nazareth in providing a way of redemption for the human race he should be sure that he is the bearer of a divine message. He should not attempt to lead his fellow men without a star in the heavens, or undertake to destroy the hope of the human race until he has something better to put in its place. It is but natural for a creedless prophet to cry, "No creed." Dr. Eliot's new religion starts on its career with a merry rabble of negations, telling the world what it must not believe. It will not be founded on "authority, either temporal or spiritual." Therefore this new testament of the Harvard prophet will have no foundation to rest on. "There will be no definition of remarkable human beings." There will,